Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards

507th Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-1154 Pages 1-28

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

		•
1	UNITED STATES	OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATOR	RY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +	- +
4	507TH MEE	TING
5	ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REAC	CTOR SAFEGUARDS (ACRS)
б	+ + + +	- +
7	WEDNESDAY, NOVEN	MBER 5, 2003
8	+ + + +	- +
9	ROCKVILLE, N	MARYLAND
10	+ + + +	- +
11	The Advisory Com	mittee met at 10:30 a.m.
12	at the Nuclear Regulatory Com	mission, Two White Flint
13	North, Room T2B3, 11545 Rock	ville Pike, Dr. Mario V.
14	Bonaca, Chairman, presiding.	
15	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	
16	MARIO V. BONACA Chairm	an
17	GRAHAM B. WALLIS Vice-C	hairman
18	STEPHEN L. ROSEN Member	-at-Large
19	F. PETER FORD Member	
20	GEORGE E. APOSTOLAKIS Member	
21	THOMAS S. KRESS Member	
22	GRAHAM M. LEITCH Member	
23	VICTOR H. RANSOM Member	
24	WILLIAM J. SHACK Member	
25	JOHN D. SIEBER Member	
•		

		-
1	ACRS STAFF PRESENT:	
2	MARVIN D. SYKES	
3	JOHN T. LARKINS	Executive Director-ACRS/ACNW
4	SHER BAHADUR	Associate Director-ACRS/ACNW
5	HOWARD J. LARSON	Special Assistant-ACRS/ACNW
6	SAM DURAISWAMY	Technical Assistant-ACRS/ACNW
7		
8	PRESENTERS:	
9	SATISH AGGARWAL	NRR
10	AMRITPAL GILL	
11		
12	NRC STAFF PRESENT:	
13	SHERRY A. MEADOR	
14	SAMUEL HERNANDEZ	
15	NILESH C. CHOKSHI	
16	JIENDRA VORA	
17	ALLEN HISER	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	I-N-D-E-X	
2	Agenda Item <u>I</u>	<u>Page</u>
3	1) Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman	4
4	1.1) Opening Statement	4
5	1.2) Items of current interest	5
6	2) Draft Final Regulatory Guide 1.32,	6
7	Revision 3, "Criteria for Power Systems for	
8	Nuclear Plants"	
9	2.1) Remarks by the Subcommittee Chairman	6
10	2.2) Briefing by and discussions with	7
11	representatives of the NRC staff	
12	regarding the draft final Revision 3	
13	to Regulatory Guide 1.32 which endorses	
14	IEEE Standard 308-2001, "Criteria for	
15	Class 1E Power Systems for Nuclear	
16	Generating Systems"	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (10:27 a.m.)

1) OPENING REMARKS BY THE ACRS CHAIRMAN

1.1) OPENING STATEMENT

CHAIRMAN BONACA: Good morning. The meeting will now come to order. This is the first day of the 507th meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

During today's meeting, the committee will consider the following: draft final Regulatory Guide 1.32, Revision 3, "Criteria for Power Systems for Nuclear Plants"; safeguards and security matters. This meeting will be closed between 1:30 and 7:00 p.m. to discuss safeguards and security matters.

This meeting is being conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Dr. John Larkins is the designated federal official for the initial portion of the meeting.

We have received no written comments or requests for time to make oral statements from members of the public regarding today's sessions. A transcript of portions of the meeting is being kept. It is requested that the speakers use one of the microphones, identify themselves, and speak with

sufficient clarity and volume so that they can be readily heard.

1.2) ITEMS OF CURRENT INTEREST

CHAIRMAN BONACA: Before we move on to the first item on our agenda, I would like to point out that between 11:30, when this meeting is supposed to recess, and 1:30, you are not going to have a long What is going to happen is that I would like lunch. you to get some lunch with you, come back here at 12:15, if you could, and help me discuss the issue of stabilizing the quality expectations PRA and Then at 12:45, we are having Gary requirements. Hollahan come in and share some of the thoughts and give him some of the views of the committee on that issue that you know of. I sent out a request about 10 days ago for discussion and review.

The pressure for this timing is already coming from the means of the commission. So I would like to ask you to be patient with that and come back here at 12:15 and be ready to discuss that issue.

So with that, let's move on to the first item on the agenda, which is the final draft final Regulatory Guide 1.32. John Sieber is going to take us through that presentation.

MEMBER SIEBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2) DRAFT FINAL REGULATORY GUIDE 1.32, REVISION 3, "CRITERIA FOR POWER SYSTEMS FOR NUCLEAR PLANTS"

2.1) REMARKS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

MEMBER SIEBER: Reg Guide 1.32 relates to power systems and endorses IEEE standard 308. If you research standard 308, the original version was published in 1970. And there have been six revisions to it, last of which was published in 2001 and was basically an update and brought in things like verification and validation, which we discussed at our last meeting.

incorporates five other IEEE standards. And these are incorporated in the body of the text of the standard. It also references 11 additional IEEE standards. Now, the ones that are referenced are not required under the reg guide if they're referenced in the back, but if they're referenced in the text of the standard, they are.

So, with that little bit of introduction, I have gone through all of these standards and the reg guide and the comments. And so I think that we are now prepared for the staff's presentation. So, with that, Satish Aggarwal, you can begin your presentation.

MR. AGGARWAL: Thank you, John.

2.2) BRIEFING BY AND DISCUSSIONS WITH

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NRC STAFF

MR. AGGARWAL: Mr. Chairman, this is revision 3 to regulatory guide 1.32, vital criteria for power systems for nuclear power plants. The purpose of this meeting is to seek your concurrence of the staff position. And we will be looking forward to receiving a letter accordingly.

As I pointed out in my last appearance here, there are many, many reg guides in the electrical area which are outdated because they endorse the standards that date somewhere between 1970 and onward. The staff is making a sincere attempt to update these reg guides as fast as possible.

Before today, before you, this is a standard 308 with the original reg guide that was issued in 1977. Revision 2 of the reg guide endorses the IEEE standard 308-1974, which is, of course, outdated.

The staff issued a draft Regulatory Guide DZ1-079 in May 2003 for public comment. This draft guide endorses the IEEE standard 308-2001, as John pointed out earlier.

The comment period expired on July 31st, 2003. And we received only one comment letter. That comment letter was attached. The memo, which was sent to John Larkins, you have a copy of it.

As you will notice, the comment letter, the comments were editorial, they were minor, and they were incorporated. So as far as the public is concerned, there are no comments, period.

Let me just take you and run by you, what are we talking about today and what is the purpose of power systems. As the title tells you, the major role is simply to provide electric power to the reactor trip system, engineering safety features, and auxiliary supporting features.

This is a very unique safety system that extends towards the plant and also the supporting system. And I will briefly take a few minutes to talk to you about the scope and tell you what really does it cover.

This guide applies to AC power systems, DC power systems, and instrumentation and control power systems. Let me take, as I said earlier, a few minutes to walk through and let you understand what does it really cover.

If you are talking about equipment, we 1 2 will cover switch gear, table. That's a charger. 3 These are simply examples I just want to give to you. If you are looking at components, we are 4 looking at transformers, the level for 41-60 level, as 5 6 the case may be, when we talk about sources, we will be looking for standby generators. All are part of 7 8 the power system. Well, let's talk about actuation devices. 9 10 And if we are talking about actuation devices, we will be looking at cycle breakers, controllers, control 11 12 relays, and switching. And if we look at the 13 actuation equipment, we will be looking at motors, 14 heaters. 15 And now if we looked at the 16 instrumentation control and electrical protection, of 17 course, we will be looking for current transformers, voltage transformers, microprocessors, protective 18 19 relays. They are all part of the power systems. So in the case of the 20 MEMBER LEITCH: diesels, this standard would include the diesel 21 22 generator but not the engine? 23 MR. AGGARWAL: That's right. 24 MEMBER LEITCH: What about the main unit 25 generators? Are they covered by this?

1 MR. AGGARWAL: No sir. 2 MEMBER LEITCH: Okay. Thank you. 3 MR. AGGARWAL: So essentially now comes what is the principal designed criteria. 4 Well, as usual, under a DBE, the former will not happen. 5 6 cannot lose electric power to a number of engineering safety features, surveillance devices, or protection 7 So that required safety functions 8 system devices. 9 cannot be performed, as simple as that. 10 Then you will flip a switch. You expect the light to be there. Similarly, all electric power 11 12 systems are required to ensure that the power is 13 always available. And you ought to know a loss of 14 electric power to any equipment will result in a 15 reactor transient. That is capable of causing 16 significant damage to the reactor coolant pressure 17 boundary or to fuel flooding. that were if 18 MEMBER LEITCH: So 19 transient there, it is more severe than might be normally understood? For example, I might think of a 20 21 reactor scram as a reactor transient, but it's not 22 included in that definition? MR. AGGARWAL: Well, the definition is not 23 24 there. All it is saying is that, hey, you do not want 25 to see a loss of power to any given system under a

1 design basis even. One redundant train or 2 division must always be available to perform a safety function. So this is all we are saying. And that is 3 an event in the basic design. 4 If you have a coal spray pump, 5 6 example, in a nuclear power plant, and two of them are and one of them is assigned to express, we are saying, 7 hey, one will always be available. So that is a 8 9 principal design criteria. This is what we want to 10 ensure. My only question is the 11 MEMBER LEITCH: 12 word "transient." What you really mean there is it is 13 a damaging event, right? 14 MR. AGGARWAL: That is right. All we are 15 saying, if you have loss of power for both buses, you 16 have a problem. It could be a reactor scram. 17 could be a transient. And it could be give you safety It's as simple as that. 18 function. Paul Gill is here from NRR. 19 He was a member of the working group who wrote the standard. 20 21 Let us walk through what the IEEE for 2001 22 It provides a principal design criteria, provides. 23 which I outline. It provides requirement for the test 24 and surveillance.

What really the standard is telling is what kind of a pre-op original equipment test and inspection you will be performing, the standard for our guidance for pre-operational system test, which must also be performed.

And with regard to the surveillance, the operational status information must be provided for the power system inside the control room or outside at all times. This can be done by continuously monitoring or by PRA test, either option. The bottom line is the CRO should be aware what is happening at any time to an E-1 system.

Does this standard also provide guidance for sharing safety-related power systems in multi-unit stations? Let me pause here for a moment and bring to your attention that this reg guide as presented to you endorses 308-2001 with a minor exception. And that exception is where you have a regulatory guide 1.81 on sharing shutdown in electric system from multi-unit nuclear power plants.

What this guide states is that you shall not share DC systems. Now, as you know, this is a very old guide. In those days, you used to use the word "share," which, as you know, we don't use that any more in reg guides. But this is the way it is.

1	The standard is saying that you can share	
2	systems as long as you can technically justify it.	
3	The staff position is to maintain the old position,	
4	namely you shall not share DC systems in a multi-unit	
5	station. I just want to bring it to your attention so	
6	you know.	
7	Now, the standards also provide the	
8	requirement for documentation, verification, and	
9	validation. We did talk about this in earlier	
10	meetings.	
11	MEMBER SIEBER: In this event, V&V only	
12	applies to digital systems. For example, there	
13	MR. AGGARWAL: Essentially.	
14	MEMBER SIEBER: There are a lot of digital	
15	devices that are now used as protection devices,	
16	timing relays, and so forth, which have a program.	
17	And V&V would be applied to that.	
18	MR. AGGARWAL: That is correct. At the	
19	point of information to the committee, the staff will	
20	be coming soon, hopefully early next year, a standard	
21	which is on computer, use of computer and safety	
22	systems. We are trying to deal with ahead of IEEE	
23	2003. It is still under print.	
24	And the staff has already prepared a reg	
25	guide endorsing that. And the goal is that the moment	

the standards are available, they are here. And that will again cover V&V, specifically the digital equipment.

I would also like to bring to your attention now what are the significant changes in 1974. Some of them which you, John, highlighted, but let me very briefly walk through. You see, when we were writing the standard in the 1974, our experience was very limited in nuclear power plants.

We really didn't know what we were really doing. And the information was sketchy but was still defendable. Over 30 years, we have learned that. And we are trying to provide an up-to-date status on the state-of-the-art of the technology.

So we have clearly now defined what is our design basis for safety-related power systems are. In my last meeting with you, I talked to you about single-failure criteria quite at length, the application.

And, again, the same criteria applies to the power systems. Then the basic issue some of you may be aware of is that in this state, there are concerns that the utility put a lot of non-safety-related load on safety-related buses. It

is a normal practice. And economics drives that kind of a practice.

So it was imperative that a standard come out and tell, "Hey, when you do so, what we would like you, when you would like the load to be disconnected."

And that guidance is included in 2001.

Independent of the safety-related power system, this is another issue where, again, at the point of information to the committee, the staff will be coming soon. As a matter of fact, you already have seen the draft guide, Reg Guide 1.75, on independence criteria. We know the status is trying to be more realistic in terms of those distances. So this standard provides that guidance also.

One of the other things we did was provide some guidance for the circuits that penetrate containment. Let me briefly explain to you what I meant by that, the idea being that the failure of any circuit, whether AC/DC, doesn't matter, any circuit, shall not result in exceeding the current versus capability of penetration for concentration for that circuit, essentially saying that, hey, don't lose it under any circumstances.

I briefly touched earlier when I talked about pre-op testing of safety-related systems. Does

the standard provide guidance? I also talked about a 1 2 other items, namely total of the multi-unit 3 consideration, and the surveillance requirements for safety systems. 4 MEMBER LEITCH: As far as future reactors 5 6 go, might it be more clear to indicate whether you are 7 speaking about multi generators or multi reactors when 8 you say "multi-unit"? I'm not sure what you mean. 9 I could envision a time when there might 10 be two reactors, for example, in a modular situation, 11 two reactors driving one turbine. Is that one unit or 12 two? 13 MR. AGGARWAL: This IEEE standard is still 14 based on a current design. 15 MEMBER LEITCH: It's based on? 16 MR. AGGARWAL: Current design. 17 MEMBER LEITCH: Current design. And when we talked about multi-unit, we simply meant more than 18 19 one BWR at one plant or more than one PWR. MR. AGGARWAL: So it assumes that there is 20 21 one reactor driving one generator. MEMBER LEITCH: That could be. That could 22 23 But I may also point out as a point of be. 24 information, I am now going to change my hat to IEEE. 25 We in IEEE are looking ten to 15 years ahead. We are

looking at different designs, possible designs, which 1 2 may be used anywhere in the world. 3 What is behind it is that even though the United States is not having a license in new plants, 4 5 many other countries are. And these standards are 6 used worldwide. Besides, ten years from now, we will come 7 with a newer advanced reactor. Then the standards 8 9 should be up to date. So we are looking in the design 10 basis events on those designs and how and why and what 11 area we should revise this standard. That has already 12 taken place and will continue. 13 MEMBER SIEBER: It seems to me that the 14 mid-term reactors or transitional reactors like AP1000, AP600, ESBWR, the concepts involved there were 15 16 considered by the staff in the development of this 17 standard. MR. AGGARWAL: That's right. 18 19 MEMBER SIEBER: So, really, what you are 20 talking about for a new standard or another revised 21 standard goes beyond those intermediate concepts. 22 MR. AGGARWAL: We will create probably 23 more --24 MEMBER LEITCH: There was a plant on the 25 drawing boards. It was never built. It had, I think

1	it was, two reactors driving one turbine or maybe it
2	was the other way around. I forget which.
3	MR. AGGARWAL: Yes. Probably
4	MEMBER LEITCH: It was never built, but it
5	had a construction permit, I think.
6	MR. AGGARWAL: Well, the focus in this
7	standard is not how to define multi-unit stations.
8	Focus is very simple in this standard. They are
9	talking about whether you share systems. I give you,
10	for example, some of you again may be familiar with
11	Hatch nuclear power plant at three diesel generators.
12	Okay? One is assigned to each unit.
13	MEMBER SIEBER: Right.
14	MR. AGGARWAL: And it can be shared by the
15	unit. So you need some kind of a requirement when
16	there is sharing involved. It's a simple example.
17	Does this standard provide that kind of criteria?
18	What do you do?
19	MEMBER SIEBER: Actually, the standard
20	focuses on the protection of a single reactor.
21	MR. AGGARWAL: Basically.
22	MEMBER SIEBER: And so the extent to which
23	all of the protection systems and electric power
24	systems apply to a single reactor, then if there is a
25	multi-unit site in the sharing restrictions, which

1	aren't allowed for DC under reg guide 1.81, I think,
2	and to a limited extent for AC. So I think you could
3	fit it into a multi-reactor, multi-unit plant.
4	MR. AGGARWAL: That's right, John.
5	VICE-CHAIRMAN WALLIS: When you say "we"
6	all the time, you are talking about IEEE?
7	MR. AGGARWAL: I highlighted when I say I
8	am changing my hat.
9	VICE-CHAIRMAN WALLIS: Yes, but most of
10	the time you are talking about IEEE, and you still say
11	"we." Is that because the NRC has a significant
12	representation on the IEEE committee or something?
13	MR. AGGARWAL: That is correct.
14	VICE-CHAIRMAN WALLIS: All right.
15	MR. AGGARWAL: Just to clarify, our staff
16	is participating in the development of all nuclear
17	standards. In 1990, we did publish all the nuclear
18	standards applied to nuclear power plants. But, as
19	you know, we are no longer in the paper world. They
20	are electronic. So we are not going to publish any
21	more of this kind of compilation. The standards are
22	available electronically.
23	Yes, the staff participates at the nuclear
24	power engineering committee. We participate at
25	different subcommittee levels. And the staff heavily

participates in working group actually writing the 1 2 standards. 3 As an example, I pointed out Paul Gill is from NRR, from the Electrical Branch. 4 He was the 5 member of the working group who developed 6 standards. And he is still there. 7 VICE-CHAIRMAN WALLIS: Is this the shortest reg guide ever written? 8 MR. AGGARWAL: Yes, sir, because it's very 9 10 You see, let me again point out one thing. simple. 11 It may not appear to many people at the front side. 12 In all the reg guides if you go back, we take many, 13 many exceptions. 14 What the staff is doing is working hard 15 with the industry and let them understand where he is 16 coming from and see if we can sell our point of view. 17 Thereby, we do not take exceptions because those requirements meet the regulations. 18 And the added advantage is that I don't have to come here and defend 19 the exceptions. So the staff addressed let's do it at 20 21 the IEEE level. 22 Now, 603 IEEE, this was a major part in this standard that it should be consistent. I might 23 24 also point out that 603 is incorporated by reference 25 in our regulations.

John pointed out earlier that many of these standards, the criteria was provided for interfacing with IEEE standards, which are cited here. And, finally, I would like to point out two more things, that the criteria for power quality, to include potentially fact of harmonic distortion and degraded grid conditions, were included.

Now let me talk to you about what harmonic distortion really means. The variation of voltage, frequency, and form, including the fact of harmonic distortion, in any mode we have provided the guidance in this standard.

What we are really saying, in nuclear plants, power plant operation shall no degrade the performance of any safety systems or load at any given time. And this is essentially the criteria given here.

We also provided how do you deal with degraded grid conditions. And this takes you to another IEEE standard, 741. Hopefully we get some time available. We will also try to endorse that.

So essentially, Mr. Chairman, as pointed out, the very simplistic or direct guide endorsing the consensus standards, this will conclude my presentation with the request that the staff is

looking forward to receiving a letter of endorsement 1 2 from the ACRS. And I will be happy to answer any 3 other questions you might have or any other member might have. 4 MEMBER SIEBER: I have --5 6 MR. AGGARWAL: Yes, sir? 7 MEMBER SIEBER: -- an issue you may want to think about. And it has to do with DC power 8 used 9 systems when they are to power 10 microprocessor-based controls or protection devices. 11 The fact that a DC power system is sitting 12 on a battery with some capacity but as relays open and 13 close, you get lots of harmonic distortions, that's a 14 reflection on the bus itself, which has a tendency and 15 can trip microprocessor devices. I've seen a number 16 of examples. 17 Unfortunately, if you have the devices on every bus, all the buses fail to operate 18 19 properly. 20 MR. AGGARWAL: Sure. 21 MEMBER SIEBER: It changes through the 22 lifetime as relay contacts get dirty and reluctance 23 changes and so forth. So to me that is sort of a 24 serious problem which says you almost ought to be 25 looking at DC buses for harmonic distortion on a

1	periodic basis because it changes through the life of
2	the plant.
3	I don't see that specifically in here, but
4	I think one could interpret that that is an issue.
5	And if you use the surge protection regulations or
6	standards, you can probably construe those to avoid
7	this situation. But it has occurred in plants. So I
8	would just mention that to me, it is an issue.
9	MR. AGGARWAL: Yes. John, you are right.
10	It is a concern. Particularly more and more
11	microprocessors
12	MEMBER SIEBER: That's right.
13	MR. AGGARWAL: and these documents are
14	used in nuclear power plants. To me, that is implicit
15	in this standard but is not explicit.
16	MEMBER SIEBER: That's right.
17	MR. AGGARWAL: I totally agree with you.
18	And Paul will take this to the committee at the next
19	significant time.
20	MR. GILL: As a matter of fact, we have
21	talked about the impact of harmonics
22	MEMBER SIEBER: Right.
23	MR. GILL: on DC and AC systems.

1	MEMBER SIEBER: Yes. I think that the
2	committee should know I know a couple of people on it.
3	And I know that they know what I know.
4	MR. AGGARWAL: Yes. This is serious. I
5	mean, you talk about inter-power plant. I'm even
6	concerned at my home. I mean, I am not concerned with
7	the distortion there because there is no DC power.
8	MEMBER SIEBER: Right.
9	MR. AGGARWAL: But, hey, any kind of
10	distortion can knock out my motherboard on my
11	computer. So, you know, it is a fear. And when you
12	talk about nuclear power plants, DC systems, they can
13	bring havoc if they fail to perform.
14	CHAIRMAN BONACA: We had a question up
15	here from Steve.
16	MEMBER ROSEN: One question about your
17	expectations for this standard being adopted as an
18	ANSI standard.
19	MR. AGGARWAL: As a matter of policy, all
20	of the standards which are IEEE standards become ANSI
21	standards. And we work under that guidance.
22	I might also extend your question a little
23	further. IEEE is now looking on a broader view. And
24	we are looking as a whole. And we want to work
25	together with IEC to ensure that some of our

standards, either they're published with a logo or we 1 2 at least move in that direction. 3 And that is staff because today if you built a reactor in a foreign country, they keep asking 4 5 you, "Did you read ISO 9000?" and people in the U.S. 6 say, "What?" So we want to look into how we have a 7 happy marriage. 8 ANSI standard is mind а no, never 9 situation. All of the standards become ANSI 10 standards. But how will them adopted we get 11 throughout the world in conjunction with IEC? It's a 12 goal. 13 And, again, I'm speaking for IEEE and not 14 for the NRC staff. 15 MEMBER ROSEN: Okay. 16 MR. AGGARWAL: Thank you. 17 Any other questions? It's interesting to me 18 MEMBER LEITCH: 19 that over the past few days and I guess predicted for the next couple of weeks, there is a discussion about 20 solar flares. Was there any consideration of that in 21 22 this standard? I know those activities --23 MR. AGGARWAL: Not in this standard, but 24 this is one of the technical issues you know, evolving 25 issues, which you may want to look into.

few years ago they talked magnetic disturbances 1 2 developing from some? This is again something very 3 new. And as we progress in developing the 4 standards, we will give due consideration. 5 And, 6 again, the workgroup is going to look into it. 7 MR. GILL: Well, in part, the standard 8 covers the safety systems. And they are in the 9 building. 10 MEMBER SIEBER: That's right. 11 MR. GILL: So they're not impacted as the 12 systems that are outside the building. So solar --13 MEMBER LEITCH: I guess it's mainly been 14 a problem with high-voltage transmission systems. 15 MR. GILL: And transformers and equipment 16 and so on. So by the time that energy travels inside 17 the building, it's attenuated to the point that it's not something that the working group is aware of. 18 19 So should we find any operating 20 experience, we will then duly take to consider that or include it in the next revision. So every five years 21 22 as an IEEE body, we are going to revise 308. 23 MEMBER LEITCH: It seems to me there was 24 plant that I quess felt were particularly 25 susceptible from a grid stability situation if they

1	lost certain transmission lines and they reduced power
2	or maybe I don't think they took a unit off, but I
3	think they reduced power. As I recall, it was Salem
4	and Hope Creek in that complex there during a period
5	of solar flare activity they reduced power.
6	They have not done that this time to the
7	best of my knowledge. But I think one of the units is
8	off for refueling anyway. So it's an interesting
9	thing.
10	MR. AGGARWAL: Paul mentioned five and ten
11	years. That comes out of the ANSI. ANSI has told us
12	that they will not tolerate any standard 30 years old
13	or 25 years on the books. They're asking now that ten
14	years is a life standard and that during that time you
15	can revise earlier, but you must revise.
16	MEMBER LEITCH: Or reaffirm.
17	MR. AGGARWAL: Or reaffirm or do something
18	about it. Okay?
19	MEMBER LEITCH: Yes.
20	MR. AGGARWAL: Failing such a decision by
21	IEEE will no longer be an ANSI standard.
22	MEMBER SIEBER: Well, does anybody else
23	have any questions?
24	(No response.)

1	MEMBER SIEBER: If not, I would like to	
2	thank the staff very much for their work and their	
3	presentation. And, Mr. Chairman, that's it.	
4	CHAIRMAN BONACA: Thank you.	
5	MR. AGGARWAL: Thank you very much.	
6	CHAIRMAN BONACA: A good presentation.	
7	MR. AGGARWAL: I think you will have a	
8	little longer lunchtime now.	
9	CHAIRMAN BONACA: Well, it will put us	
10	back on our schedule. That's great. Thank you for	
11	that. I think we will take a recess for lunch now.	
12	And I think we will go off the record for the day. We	
13	will start again tomorrow morning. And we meet again	
14	here at 12:15 to exchange views on this document that	
15	you have all received before Gary comes at 12:45.	
16	(Whereupon, at 11:04 a.m., the foregoing	
17	matter was recessed for lunch, to	
18	reconvene at 12:15 p.m. the same day in	
19	closed session.)	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

]	29
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		